

AMENDMENTS TO THE CLAIMS

Claims 1-16 (Cancelled)

Claim 17 (Previously presented): A process for the control of weeds in cultivations of useful plants which are resistant to a phospho-herbicide without significantly damaging the useful plants, characterised in that a herbicidally effective amount of a composition containing a phospho-herbicide selected from the group consisting of glufosinate and glyphosate, a synergistic amount of at least one further herbicide selected from the group consisting of prosulfuron, primisulfuron, dicamba, pyridate, dimethenamide and its S-enantiomer, metolachlor and its S-enantiomer, propaquizafop, atrazine, and terbuthylazine is allowed to take effect on the cultivated plant or its habitat and wherein the useful plants are not significantly damaged, with the provision that compositions containing glufosinate and metolachlor, glufosinate and atrazine, glufosinate and a mixture of metolachlor and atrazine, as well as glufosinate and a mixture of atrazine and dicamba are not used in glufosinate-resistant maize, and further that compositions containing glyphosate and atrazine are not used in glyphosate-resistant maize, and compositions containing glyphosate and metalochlor or glyphosate and dimethenamide are not used in glyphosate-resistant soya.

Claim 18 (Currently amended): The process according to claim 17, characterised in that the useful plant being cultivated is maize which is resistant to glufosinate and/or glyphosate, and the composition contains glufosinate or glyphosate and a synergistic amount of at least one further herbicide selected from the group consisting of prosulfuron, primisulfuron, dicamba, pyridate, dimethenamide as well as its S-enantiomer, metolachlor as well as its S-enantiomer and terbuthylazine, with the provision that compositions containing glufosinate and metolachlor as well as glufosinate and a mixture of atrazine and dicamba are not used in glufosinate-resistant maize.

Claim 19 (Previously presented): The process according to claim 18, characterised in that the useful plant being cultivated is maize which is resistant to glufosinate, and the composition contains glufosinate and a synergistic amount of at least one further herbicide selected from the group consisting of prosulfuron, primisulfuron, pyridate, dimethenamide as well as its S-enantiomer and terbuthylazine.

Claim 20 (Previously presented): The process according to claim 18, characterised in that the useful plant being cultivated is maize which is resistant to glyphosate, and the composition contains glyphosate and a synergistic amount of at least one further herbicide selected from the group

consisting of primisulfuron, dicamba, dimethenamide as well as its S-enantiomer and metolachlor as well as its S-enantiomer.

Claim 21 (Previously presented): The process according to claim 20, wherein the composition comprises a mixture of glyphosate and metolachlor.

Claim 22 (Previously presented): The process according to claim 20, wherein the composition comprises a mixture of glyphosate, metolachlor and atrazine.

Claim 23 (Previously presented): The process according to claim 20, wherein the composition comprises a mixture of glyphosate and the S-enantiomer of metolachlor.

Claim 24 (Previously presented): The process according to claim 20, wherein the composition comprises a mixture of glyphosate, the S-enantiomer of metolachlor and atrazine.

Claim 25 (Previously presented): The process according to claim 20, wherein the composition comprises a mixture of glyphosate and dicamba.

Claim 26 (Previously presented): The process according to claim 20, wherein the composition comprises a mixture of glyphosate, dicamba and atrazine.

Claim 27 (Previously presented): The process according to claim 20, wherein the composition comprises a mixture of glyphosate and dimethenamide or the S-enantiomer of dimethenamide.

Claim 28 (Previously presented): The process according to claim 20, wherein the composition comprises a mixture of glyphosate and primisulfuron.

Claim 29 (Previously presented): The process according to claim 17, characterised in that the useful plant being cultivated is soya which is resistant to glufosinate, and the composition contains glufosinate and a synergistic amount of at least one further herbicide selected from the group consisting of dimethenamide as well as its S-enantiomer and metolachlor as well as its S-enantiomer.

Claim 30 (Previously presented): The process according to claim 29, wherein the composition comprises a mixture of glufosinate and dimethenamide.

Claim 31 (Previously presented): The process according to claim 29, wherein the composition comprises a mixture of glufosinate and the S-enantiomer of dimethenamide.

Claim 32 (Previously presented): The process according to claim 29, wherein the composition comprises a mixture of glufosinate and metolachlor.

Claim 33 (Previously presented): The process according to claim 29, wherein the composition comprises a mixture of glufosinate and the S-enantiomer of metolachlor.

Claim 34 (Previously presented): The process according to claim 17, characterised in that the useful plant being cultivated is rape or beet which are resistant to glufosinate and/or glyphosate, and the composition contains glufosinate or glyphosate and a synergistic amount of propaquizafop.

Claim 35 (Previously presented): The process according to claim 17, characterised in that the useful plant being cultivated is cotton which is resistant to glyphosate, and the composition comprises glyphosate and metolachlor.

Claim 36 (Previously presented): The process according to claim 17, characterised in that the useful plant being cultivated is cotton which is resistant to glyphosate, and the composition comprises glyphosate and the S-enantiomer of metolachlor.

Claim 37 (Previously presented): The process according to claim 17, characterised in that the useful plant cultivations are treated with the said composition at application rates corresponding to 0.3 to 4.0 kg total active ingredient per hectare.